

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The undersigned attorney would like to thank the examiner for extending the courtesy of conducting a telephonic interview on 3 July 2007. Proposed amendments to claim 1 and U.S. Patent No. 4,992,933 were discussed. No agreement was reached.

In paragraph 4 of the Office action, claims 1 – 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The examiner suggested amending the claims to add a storing step as a result of the selecting to require a change in a register or memory. All of the independent claims have been amended as suggested by the examiner. Claims 1 – 26 are believed to be in condition for allowance with respect to 35 U.S.C. § 101.

In paragraph 5 of the Office action, claims 1-2, 5-11, 15-16, and 19-26 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Taylor (U.S. Patent No. 4,992,933). In response, independent claims 1, 5, 8, 16, 20, 23, and 26 have been amended. Support for the amendments, and an understanding of the invention as claimed, are found in the following excerpts from the specification.

“A PE can conditionally select any of the values it sees as its final output value by conditionally loading that value, which is representative of an output result matrix.” Paragraph [0064]. “All X values are passed through the PE; the required output value is conditionally loaded once it has arrived in the PE.” Paragraph [0065]. “The timing of the loading is achieved by maintaining a current count in a local counter, which is typically implemented in software.” Paragraph [0066].

Taylor discloses an array 12 of processing elements T(ij) under the control of an array controller 14. See column 3, lines 32 – 35. There is no disclosure in Taylor of maintaining a count in each of a plurality of processing elements as recited in claims 1, 5, 16, and 26. There is no disclosure in Taylor of “selecting from among the data” according to a count (claims 1, 5, 16, and 26) or a location (claim 8) or formula (20, 23). Rather, as discussed in the example in Taylor in column 9, lines 31-49 “exactly M steps along the path leads to the correct processing element for the mapping.” The “common factor for each of the loops is that a bit which is shifted 33 times along the loop in which it is located will end up in the corresponding position in the adjacent quadrant. In other words, in 33 steps, the whole array is rotated by 90 degrees.” Thus,

the array controller 14 only needs to maintain a count up to 33 for every element in the array of processing elements. No individual count is necessary for each processing element and no selection among the received data is required. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Taylor should be withdrawn.

In paragraph 24 of the Office action, dependent claims 3, 4, 12-14, and 17-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taylor. It is respectfully submitted that each of these dependent claims depends from an independent claim which is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, at this time, applicant does not submit any amendments or remarks in support of the patentability of the aforementioned dependent claims. Applicant reserves the right to submit such arguments and amendments in the future should that become necessary.

Applicant has made a diligent effort to place the instant application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a notice of allowance for claims 1-26 is respectfully requested. If the examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than through allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to contact applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Edward L. Pencoske  
Reg. No. 29,688  
Jones Day  
One Mellon Center  
500 Grant Street, Suite 3100  
Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 15219  
(412) 394-9531  
(412) 394-7959 (Fax)  
Attorneys for Applicant